

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 have been presented for Examination.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his time on July 1, 2004 for an Examiner Interview. During the interview, the Examiner suggested amending independent claims to further clarify the functional relationships of various elements. Applicants have amended independent claims to incorporate the Examiner's suggestions.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis U.S. Patent 6,498,806 131. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify that a second interface is configured to couple the transceiver to a network node via a first master communication loop and via a second communications loop, wherein the second communications loop is configured to serve a second communications terminal. Davis does not teach this limitation. Accordingly, claims 1, 12, and 19 are patentably distinguishable from Davis.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from Davis for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 12 has been rejected in the manner of claim 1. Claim 12 has been amended in the manner of claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Davis for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 13-18 depend from claim 12 and are patentably distinguishable from Davis for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

As to claim 19, Davis does not disclose communicating information between a first communication terminal and a network node simultaneously over the first communication loop

and at least one other communication loop, wherein the at least one other communication loop is configured to couple the network node to at least one other communication terminal. In contrast, Davis discloses individual communication loops 218 for each client modem 214. Thus, the bandwidth of communication between the network node and the client modem is limited by the capacity of the individual communication loops 218. Davis does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation of coupling the client modems 214 to at least one other communication loop as recited in claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19 is patentably distinguishable from Davis.

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is patentably distinguishable from Davis for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, the Examiner is requested to contact the below named attorney for Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137